



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

fw

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/080,202	02/20/2002	Zaher A. Samman	US020048	9268
24737	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				NATNAEL, PAULOS M
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2614		

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/080,202	SAMMAN ET AL.
	Examiner Paulos M. Natnael	Art Unit 2614

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 25 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 9-14.

Claim(s) objected to: 2,4,6 and 8.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,5,7.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see response to arguments presented in Office Action of.  
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.  
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



Paulos M. Natnael  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2614

Applicant argues referring to claim 1 that George does not teach forming an adjustment measure from the output signals of two optical sensors, and George does not teach adjusting the centering of a raster based on such an adjustment measure.

Applicant argues also George does not teach forming an adjustment measure from the output signals of two optical sensors, and George does not teach adjusting the width of a raster based on such an adjustment measure.

Applicant further argues that George does not teach forming an adjustment measure from the output signals of two optical sensors, and George does not teach adjusting the linearity of a raster based on such an adjustment measure.

Applicant argues that George does not teach forming an adjustment measure from the output signals of two optical sensors, and George does not teach adjusting the height of a raster based on such an adjustment measure. In response to the applicant's prior remarks, the office action fails to identify an adjustment measure in George that is formed by combining the output of two opposing sensors, and fails to identify a teaching in George wherein this (non-existent) adjustment measure is used to adjust the centering, width, linearity, or height of a raster. The Office action notes that George teaches receiving an output signal from multiple sensors, but fails to identify a teaching in George that the signals from opposing sensors are used to form an adjustment measure, as specifically claimed in each of the rejected claims.

In response, the examiner submits that George teaches: using the sensor positions a test pattern is electronically generated (col. 2, lines 27-35), which involves receiving the output signals of the sensors. In other words, the generated test pattern is received by the device. Furthermore, George discloses that "Controllers 900 and 301 also position block M to illuminate exemplary sensor S1 by determining horizontal and vertical timing to position block M within the scanned display raster or by moving the scanned raster, or a part of the scanned raster containing the marker block M." [emphasis added by examiner] col. 3, lines 20-25. Therefore, although George does not use the word "combine" it would be obvious to the skilled in the art that when the system of George, using the sensor positions, generates a test pattern electronically, the process would involve receiving the output signals of the sensors and the microprocessor would combine the signals to generate the test pattern which is used to control the block M, which in turn is used to control or to adjust the raster itself as disclosed shown in the quoted passage above. (Note: To combine also means, to act together, to join, intermix, blend, or merge [see Webster's Dictionary]) Thus, the argument is again unpersuasive and the claims remain rejected for the reasons above.